

Lead Abatement Trainer Newsletter

Michigan Department of Community Health Healthy Homes Section (HHS)

Concerns with Multi-Family Projects: Part 2

This is a continuation of Jeremy Westcott's article from the last news letter dealing with multi-family housing. Part two deals with clearance issues.

Whenever possible, it is advisable to encourage the owner to clear each unit where work occurred. If you use the multi-family chart to only test a representative number of units, it is too easy to flunk this clearance and then ALL UNITS must be cleaned prior to the next multi-family clearance. *By clearing each unit individually, the owner/contractor will usually save money in the end.*

Assessing the Units to Test (Representative Sampling): For multi-family clearances, the number of units that need to be sampled can again be taken from the chart in the HUD guidelines (Table 7.3) and then randomly selected. The

inspector MAY NOT use the same list of random units as the original inspection. Building owners/contractors are not to know where samples are going to be taken to insure that they address all required units. Therefore, using the previous chart would be completely inappropriate.

Visual Inspection (Representative Sampling): It is important to review all lead painted components that were found to be in poor condition in any of the original inspected units to verify that hazards were removed and no chips or debris remains.

Dust Clearances (Representative Sampling): When conducting lead clearance sampling for multi-family properties, you cannot simply take an average. Combining State of Michigan and HUD requirements, you must determine whether more than 5% of the units have a failure of

any specific component (floors, sills or troughs). If so, then all of these components (floors or sills or troughs) throughout all selected units must be re-cleaned and/or retested. You must the repeat the same process.

Clearances
In summary, if a multi-family complex has 40 or less units, always try and talk the owner into assessing and clearing all of them individually. Believe it or not, this is a win / win. You make more money and the owner almost always saves quite a lot vs. extensive failure and retesting.

For larger complexes, be very careful when selecting units, assessing hazards or conducting clearances; they are much more complicated than they look. Also be up front with the owner of the idea that "if one fails they all fail", as they will likely be very angry with the results otherwise.

June, 2012

Volume 2 Issue 1

Inside this issue:

Hands-on:	2
Metric Issues &	
Abatement Signage	2
Mil Thickness Requirements for Michigan	2
Post Exam Survey	3
New Exam Issues	3
CDC Lowers Blood Level from 10 µg/dL to 5 µg/dL	4

News Briefs:

1. The Healthy Homes Section's annual Contractor, Risk Assessor, and Trainer Workshop will be Thursday August 2nd this year. The workshop will be held at the Opera House in Grand Ledge again. If you haven't already reserved a spot you are still welcome to attend. Please call 517-335-9390 to reserve a space.
2. After almost nine years as Healthy Homes Section's senior enforcement officer Dan Lince has taken a new position with the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA). We thank him for his years of work and dedication to make lead abatement enforcement in Michigan effective and respected throughout the State and Region.
3. Paint chip sampling for Renovation, Repair, and Painting Program (RRP), will not be allowed in the State of Michigan unless the person taking the paint chip samples is certified as a lead-based paint inspector or risk assessor.
4. All abatement classes, except for workers, should have significant class time devoted to Inspection and Risk Assessment reports. Inspectors and Risk Assessors need to know how to write them, & Supervisors need to know how to read and understand them. Many enforcement cases stem from report issues.

Signage:

Recently a question was asked regarding proper signage for renovation work, as the RRP curriculum says you should use the OSHA sign wording from the Lead in Construction Standard. Since, the answer also applies to abatement work it will be addressed here. To start with there is new wording to the OSHA lead sign that will go into effect in 2016. The latest version of the OSHA Lead in Construction Standard states at 1926.62(m)(1)(i) says:

The employer shall post the following warning signs in each work area where an employee's exposure to lead is above the PEL.

DANGER
LEAD WORK AREA
MAY DAMAGE FERTILITY OR THE UN-
BORN CHILD
CAUSES DAMAGE TO THE CENTRAL
NERVOUS SYSTEM DO NOT EAT, DRINK
OR SMOKE IN THIS AREA

**“... there is new wording to the
OSHA lead sign ...”**

OSHA 1926.62(m)(1)(iv) then states:

The employer may use signs required by other statutes, regulations or ordinances in addition to, or in combination with, signs required by this paragraph (m).

If the proper OSHA sign is not on display, then for OSHA it means one of two things: Either air monitoring has been done and the work site is below the PEL, or there is suitable objective data present and available that indicates the work activities will keep worker exposure below the PEL.

If there is no air monitoring results or reliable objective data available, then OSHA could cite the contractors. MDCH does not enforce OSHA or MiOSHA regulations, cases could be forwarded if necessary.

EBL Lead Investigators Webpage:

For those of you who teach the Lead Inspector and Risk Assessor courses, there is a webpage that may be worth adding to your electronic resources library as a value-added benefit for your students who desire the Environmental Investigator certification.

The Environmental Investigation program staff have been occupied with adding material to its namesake website for over a year. The direct address is www.michigan.gov/mdch/0,4612,7-132-2940_2955_2983-226728-,00.html

The webpage maintains an EBL report template that meets state and federal requirements with corresponding instructions, a near complete list of housing components and standardized abatement and interim control options for use in the report, cover letter templates, MDCH Lead Laboratory sampling requisition forms, updated sampling protocols that meet ASTM standards and quick-reference field guides.

The statewide EBL Environmental Investigation protocol will be updated and

posted on the website this summer.

Please remind your Risk Assessment students who are planning to take the EBL exam, that it is an open-book test and they should bring a copy of the current protocol from the website.

If you have questions or ideas for additional resources for our webpage that are specific to Environmental Investigations, please contact Michele Borgi-
alli at 517.335.8948 or borgiallim@mi.gov.

Mil Thickness Modifications in Michigan:

Regarding mil thickness for plastic used for containment purposes on lead abatement projects: the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) has stated that 6 mil plastic must be used on the floor and for vertical containment on the airlock entrance door to the contained work area, while plastic that covers occupant belongings, appliances, or vertical containment to protect walls or windows may be 4 mil.

This conclusion came after research and 14 years of program experience. Clearly the HUD Guidelines recommend 6 mil for most applications, but in chapter 8 page 8 it says:

“The plastic sheeting in the tables [8.1, 8.2, and 8.3] refers to polyethylene plastic sheeting that is at least 6 mils thick (or equivalent). These recommendations represent the best guidance that can be offered at this time.”

The key is the last sentence where it states that the Guidelines, “...represent the best guidance that can be offered at this time.” Since 1995 only chapters of the HUD Guidelines, 5 and 7, have been revised. The Department believes that there is sufficient evidence to show that 4 mil plastic sheeting is adequate for areas of containment that act solely as an air barrier, keeping dust within the work area. The use of 4 mil plastic sheeting



will not be allowed for floors, exterior areas, any area where workers, materials, or where debris will come into contact with it and any other applications

that do not act solely as an air barrier. Any doorway with “primitive” airlock must use 6 mil plastic.

The HUD Guidelines do state that for bagging construction debris 6 mil bags or two 4 mil bags should be used.

MDCH agrees with that statement.

Post Exam Survey:

Starting in July, the Department is going to begin giving a post-exam evaluation survey. The intent of this survey is to give students an opportunity to voice their opinion of both you the trainers and the state examination. The goal is to learn if the students believe the class prepared them for the exam and/or did the exam fairly evaluate what they learned in class. The training providers will be made aware of the results of this survey on a quarterly basis. This feedback from the students will help if adjustments need to be made in your training to more accurately cover the learning objectives as well as inform you of areas where you are doing a good job.

For department we hope to learn more about whether the exam appropriately tests them over what they have learned in class and if there are modifications we need to make so the exam will be a better tool for determining the preparedness of students to go out and do lead abatement work properly.

The survey will have 10 questions. The answers will be recorded on bubble answer sheets that will be run through the scoring machine used to grade the exams. The answer sheets will be coded for each training provider, and when they are entered into the machine that

information can be downloaded into a computer. That information will be tabulated and sorted regarding the different training providers. There also will be an area on the survey answer sheet where students will be able to write in any comments they have regarding the training they received or the exam they just took.

Training providers will receive comments and results only for students they trained. At least once a year a report will be sent out to training providers showing how all trainers as a whole were evaluated, but no identifiers for individual trainers will be included in that report.

A full size copy of the survey will be attached with this newsletter. If you have any comments or concerns we would appreciate receiving them. You may email Jay Wagar wagarj@mi.gov or call him at 517-335-8466. Please have those comment or concerns regarding the post-exam survey submitted by July 31, 2012.

Post Exam Survey

This survey is for you to give an opinion of the training you received and the state examination. The intended purpose is to improve the quality of the trainers and the exam. You do not need to sign this survey form. The trainers will not be allowed to see the form and no specific information will be given to the trainers that could identify survey taker.

1. My training class prepared me to take the State exam.
2. My training class prepared me to be able to do lead abatement, inspector, or risk assessor activities.
3. The state exam was a fair test of my lead knowledge.
4. The trainer clearly explained the certification process.
5. The trainer clearly presented the course information.
6. The trainer remained on track teaching the information regarding lead activities.
7. The trainer provided meaningful hands-on activities to prepare me to do lead abatement, inspector, or risk assessor activities.
8. The training days lasted about 8 hours per day.
9. The trainer allowed time for questions and comments from the students.
10. I would recommend my trainer to someone else.

If you have any other comments on the training or state exam please write them on the back of the answer sheet. You might discuss what you felt most prepared for, or least prepared for. You may discuss what you did or didn't like about the exam. We appreciate your input.

Evaluation Scale: strongly agree agree neutral disagree strongly disagree

Exam Issues:

Change is still coming! The Healthy Homes Section is continuing to work on the new exams. Changes to the learning objectives for the supervisor exam have been completed. A copy of all the objectives will be sent with this newsletter. Please look the learning objectives over. It is expected that you will use the learning objectives to help guide what you teach. There are 16 new objectives. I have attached two lists. One shows which are the 16 new objectives of the 100. The other list just lists all the objectives. The lists of learning objectives is something that you could share with students for reviewing for the State exam. Mostly the new ones replace some of the OSHA questions. There is definitely more

emphasis on abatement and less on OSHA.

If you see anything that is not clear or some concept you think is lacking please let us know. The exam format is also going to change some. The biggest change is going to be that the new supervisor exam will have 110 questions. The logic is that the origi-

goal is to insure that the exam tests them on all the things that are considered important in understanding the world of lead abatement and to be able to do that work correctly, also the component quiz is an important practical assessment of whether students are familiar with construction terms and the components that make up the houses they will be working in.

The goal of these changes is to insure that we have done everything to make the students most knowledgeable and best prepared lead professionals that they can be.

The new supervisor exam will begin to be used in July. Work on the Inspector/Risk Assessor exam should be completed by October of this year.

The new supervisor exam will have 110 questions.

nal EPA exam had 100 learning objectives, but there was no component quiz, such as the current exam has. The

Michigan Department
of Community Health



**Healthy Homes Section
Contact Information**

Physical address: 201 Townsend
4th Floor
Lansing, MI 48913

Mailing address: PO Box 30195
Lansing, MI 48909

Phone: 517-335-9390
Fax: 517-335-8800
Web: www.mi.gov/leadsafe



**Healthy Homes Section
Mission Statement**

To improve the health and wellbeing of Michigan citizens by promoting safe and healthy home environments through comprehensive home-based intervention programs, lead certification and regulations, public education and outreach, and statewide partnerships.

CDC's New Number:

On May 16th 2012 the Center for Disease Control (CDC) announced the reduction in the level of lead considered to be the threshold at which action should be taken to protect children from lead exposure. The recommendation came from the Advisory Committee for Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention (ACCLPP), which had been appointed by the CDC to study the issues and propose recommendations. The ACCLPP proposed 13 recommendations and the CDC "concurred" or "concurred in principle" to all 13. The most important recommendation was the one dealing with the old "level of concern" number of 10 µg/dL of lead in the blood. The new number is 5 µg/dL, but it will no longer be referred to as the "level of concern." Since, there is no known

safe level for lead in the body it was decided that using the term "level of concern" might be giving people a false sense of security. The 5 µg/dL now will be designated as the "reference level at which CDC recommends public health actions be initiated." The CDC has indicated that going forward it will revisit the number every four years and it will be subject to possible change based on a reassessment of the lead levels in the top percentage of children displaying elevated blood lead. The new number represents the top 2.5% of blood levels tested in children.



The full list of ACCLPP recommendations and the CDC responses and comments may be found at http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/lead/ACCLPP/CDC_Response_Lead_Exposure_Recs.pdf.

Current estimates place the number of EBL children at about 250,000. At 5 µg/dL the number will jump to 450,000 immediately and possibly up to a 1,000,000 as more testing is done.

There is no federal funding immediately available to help with implementing these regulatory changes. Full implementation will be contingent on getting sufficient funding in the future.

The Healthy Home Section is looking for your input to make this newsletter a helpful and useful resource for training providers and certified lead professionals. In this edition, we had articles from two training providers and we would like additional articles from trainers and certified lead professionals as to what topics we need to address in the future.

Direct your questions, concerns, comments or ideas to Jay Wagar at:

wagarj@mi.gov, or call 517-335-8466 or mail to

MDCH-HHS
P.O. Box 30195
Lansing, MI 48909

